Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USUN N 01745 261539Z

63

ACTION DLOS-04

INFO OCT-01 IO-13 ISO-00 AF-08 ARA-06 EA-07 EUR-12 NEA-10

FEA-01 ACDA-07 AGR-05 AID-05 CEA-01 CEQ-01 CG-00

CIAE-00 CIEP-01 COME-00 DODE-00 DOTE-00 EB-07 EPA-01

ERDA-05 FMC-01 TRSE-00 H-02 INR-07 INT-05 JUSE-00

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 NSF-01 OES-06 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04

PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 SAL-01 /156 W

R 261016Z APR 76 FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK TO SECSTATE WASHDC 7093

CONFIDENTIAL USUN 1745

FROM LOS DEL

RECOMMEND DEPARTMENT POUCH TO ALL EMBASSIES

E.O. 11652: GDS TAGS: PLOS

SUBJECT: LOS COMMITTEE II DEBATE ON ARTICLE 73; HIGH SEAS.

SUMMARY: C-II SPENT HALF DAY 20 APRIL DEBATING ARTICLE 73 OF

SNT. 38 SPEAKERS (U.S., SOVS, MARITIMES, LAND-LOCKEDS) SOUGHT CHANGE TO EXISTING TEXT TO MAKE ECONOMIC ZONE HIGH SEAS FOR ALL PURPOSES EXCEPT THOSE SPECIFIED IN THE CONVENTION. EG. COASTAL STATE RESOURCE RIGHTS. 41 STATES

ARUGED TO RETAIN EXISTING TEXT (CHINA, INDIA, AFRICANS, AND VERY VOCALLY, COASTAL LATINS). CANADA, AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND SOUGHT WEAKER VERSION OF U.S. AMENDMENT. FOR COHERENCY THIS CABLE IS ORGANIZED AS FOLLOWS: DEBATE (A) FOR AMENDMENT (B) FOR RETENTION OF EXISTING TEXT (C) MIDDLE GROUND, AND (D) COMMENT. DEBATE IS NOT REPORTED CHRONOLOGICALLY. REMAINDER OF DAY'S DEBATE WILL BE REPORTED SEPTEL. END SUMMARY. CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USUN N 01745 261539Z

1. AGUILAR CHAIRED C-II MEETING 20 APRIL THAT OPENED WITH DEBATE ON ARTICLE 73 OF SNT: DEFINITION OF TERM "HIGH SEAS".

2. FOR AMENDMENTS:

SINGAPORE (KOH) OPENED WITH ARGUMENT THAT PRESENT ARTICLE 73
PRESENTED GREAT DIFFICULTIES. HE STATED THAT RULES AND
NORMS OF INTERNATONAL LAW ON HIGH SEAS SHOULD CONTINUE
TO APPLY IN THE ECONOMIC ZONE (EZ) EXCEPT AS THEY INTERFERE WITH RESOURCES. IN THE EZ THE COASTAL STATE (CS)
WILL HAVE ECONOMIC AND RELATED RIGHTS AS PROVIDED IN THE
CONVENTION. U.S. (OXMAN) INTRODUCED AMENDMENT READING:
QUOTE DELETE THE WORDS IN THE EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC
ZONE. ADD THE FOLLOWING WORDS AT THE END OF THIS
ARTICLE:

PROVIDED THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THIS PART (HIGH SEAS)
SHALL AS APPLY TO THE ECONOMIC ZONE ONLY IN SO
FAR AS THEY ARE NOT INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE
PROVISIONS OF PART III. (ECONOMIC ZONE) UNQUOTE

OXMAN ARGUED THAT U.S. WAS MAKING INTENSIVE EFFORTS TO BE MODERATE AND SEEKING FORMULA WIDELY ACCEPTABLE BUT U.S. COULD NOT ACCEPT PRESENT TEXT. ARTICLE 73, HE ADDED, IS INCONSISTENT WITH CONCEPT OF EZ, AND WOULD PREJUDICE EXISTING TREATIES, HE ADDED THAT U.S. AMENDMENT WOULD HAVE NO EFFECT ON RIGHTS OF COASTAL STATES IN EZ. SOVS DISAGREED WITH EXISTING TEST AND AGREED WITH SINGAPORE AND U.S. SOV SAID COASTAL STATES WERE BEING GRANTED BROAD SOVEREIGN RIGHTS FOR EXPLORATION AND EXPLOITATION (E&E) BUT EZ MUST NOT BE EXCLUDED FROM CON-CEPT OF HIGH SEAS. IN SPEACE BEYOND TERRITORIAL SEA (TS) ALL STATES SHOULD HAVE RIGHTS FOR LEGITIMATE USES IN ACCORDANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL LAW. TO SOVS EXISTING ARTICLE 73 WOULD DISRUPT PRINCIPLES OF NAVIGATION AND OVERFLIGHT AND UNDERMINE POSSIBILITY OF COMPROMISE. LAND-LOCKED (L/L) ARGUED THAT EXISTING ARTICLE PUTS THEM AT DISADVANTAGE AND EVEN FURTHER AWAY FROM HIGH SEAS. UK ARGUED ARTICLE 73 UPSET BALANCE ACHIEVED BETWEEN ARTICLE 45 (RIGHTS OF COASTAL STATES) AND ARTICLE 47 (RIGHTS OF OTHERS). IT WOULD CREATE A LEGAL VACUUM; THE EZ MUST BE HIGH SEAS CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USUN N 01745 261539Z

MINUS ALL RIGHTS OF COASTAL STATES EXERCISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CONVENTION.

3. STATES SUPPORTING THESE VIEWS WERE:

SINGAPORE BYELORUSSIA

U.S. UKRAINE FINLAND NORWAY GREECE IRELAND
AUSTRIA ETHIOPIA
LIBERIA BULGARIA
TURKEY KUWAIT
ITALY GDR

FRG CZECHOSLOVAKIA

ISRAEL BELGIUM FRANCE MONGOLIA

USSR UK

SWITZERLAND REPUBLIC OF KOREA

DENMARK AFGHANISTAN
SWEDEN BOTSWANA
NETHERLANDS PORTUGAL
HUNGARY BOLIVIA
POLAND ZAMBIA

IRAQ

4. PERU LED DEBATE FOR RETENTION OF EXISTING LANGUAGE OF

ARTICLE 73. ARIAS-SCHRIEBER AND OTHERS ARGUED THAT THE

TEXT REFLECTS THE PREVAILING TENDENCY OF DEBATE IN LAST

TWO CONFERENCE SESSIONS. IN HIGH SEAS STATES HAVE EQUAL

SOVEREIGNTY AND U.S. PROPOSAL SOUGHT TO DESTROY CONCEPT

OF ECONOMIC ZONE WHERE COASTAL STATES HAS CERTAIN SOVEREIGN RIGHTS.

PERU CONSIDERS THE U.S. ARGUMENTS "UTTERLY FALLACIOUS",

LACKING IN LEGAL BASIS, AND THE AMENDMENTS "DISRUPTIVE".

KENYA ADDED AMENDMENTS WERE DESIGNED TO "KILL CONCEPT OF

EZ" AND ASKED THAT MARITIME STATES EXPOSE THEIR LEGITIMATE

INTERESTS IN THE EZ FOR DISCUSSION. CHINA ATTACKED

SUPERPOWER HEGEMONIC PROPOSALS AND OPPOSED

HIGH SEAS STATES FOR ECONOMIC ZONE IN PRINCIPLE.

5. OTHERS IN OPPOSITION:

TOGO SOMALIA

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 USUN N 01745 261539Z

SPAIN OMAN TUNISIA CONGO

CAMBODIA GUATEMALA
MADAGASCAR MEXICO
ROMANIA PAKISTAN
ALBANIA UGANDA
ECUADOR YUGOSLAVIA
DEM REP. KOREA DOM. REPUBLIC

SUDAN INDONESIA
SRI LANKA GHANA
NIGERIA BRAZIL
INDIA LIBYA
CAMEROON EGYPT
URAGUAY SENEGAL
CHILE VENEZUELA

COLOMBIA PHILIPPINES IVORY COAST IRAN ARGENTINA

6. AUSTRALIA OFFERED THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT: DELETE QUOTE IN THE ECONOMIC ZONE. UNQUOTE ADD AT END OF SENTENCE: QUOTE PROVIDED THAT THE EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE IS NOT HIGH SEAS WITH RESPECT TO THE EXERCISE OF COASTAL STATES RIGHTS PROVIDED FOR IN THIS CONVENTION UNQUOTE.

7. CANADA (LA POINTE) NOTED GREAT IMPORTANCE OF ARTICLE 73 AND EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT U.S. AMENDMENT ERODES CONCEPT OF ECONOMIC ZONE. HOWEVER, CANADA REALIZES PRESENT TEXT COULD CAUSE DIFFICULTIES AND THEREFORE PROPOSES RETENTION OF ARTICLE 73 AS PARA 1 BUT WITH NEW PARA 2: QTE THE PROVISIONS OF THIS PART, AS WELL AS OTHER RELEVANT RULES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, SHALL, NOTWIGHSTANDING PARA 1 ABOVE, APPLY TO THE ECONOMIC ZONE INSOFAR AS THEY ARE NOT INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF PART 3. (NEW ZEALAND SUPPORTED CANADA).

8. COMMENT: US WAS ACTIVE IN MARSHALLING SUPPORT FOR REVISION OF ART. 73, AND DEBATE WENT FAIRLY WELL. MEMBERS OF BUREAU INVOLVED IN PREPARING REVISED TEXT HAVE INDICATED THAT ART. 73 PROBABLY WILL BE RE-DRAFTED TO RESTORE BALANCE. IF THIS HAPPENS, SUBSTANTIVE US OBJECTIVES CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 USUN N 01745 261539Z

MAY WELL BE ACHIEVED. US DEL WILL CONTINUE PUBLICLY AND PRIVATELY TO PRESS FOR MAXIMUM RETENTION OF HIGH SEAS FREEDOMS IN 200-MILE ECONOMIC ZONE. SCRANTON

NOTE BY OCT: NOT POUCHED ADDRESSEES.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994 Channel Indicators: n/a

Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Concepts: LAW OF THE SEA, TERRITORIAL SEA LIMIT, COMMITTEES, MEETINGS, MEETING PROCEEDINGS

Control Number: n/a Copy: SINGLE Draft Date: 26 APR 1976 Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960 Decaption Note: Disposition Action: RELEASED Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976LISLINN01745

Document Number: 1976USUNN01745 Document Source: CORE Document Unique ID: 00

Drafter: n/a Enclosure: n/a Executive Order: GS Errors: N/A

Film Number: D760158-0810 From: USUN NEW YORK Handling Restrictions: n/a

Image Path: ISecure: 1

Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760420/aaaaaqrg.tel Line Count: 206

Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM Office: ACTION DLOS Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL Original Handling Restrictions: n/a Original Previous Classification: n/a Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a

Page Count: 4

Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a Reference: n/a

Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED Review Authority: CunninFX

Review Comment: n/a Review Content Flags: Review Date: 19 MAY 2004

Review Event:

Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <19 MAY 2004 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <15 SEP 2004 by CunninFX>

Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MÁY 2006

Review Media Identifier: Review Referrals: n/a Review Release Date: n/a Review Release Event: n/a **Review Transfer Date:** Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a

Secure: OPEN Status: NATIVE

Subject: LOS COMMITTEE II DEBATE ON ARTICLE 73; HIGH SEAS. SUMMARY: C-II SPENT HALF DAY 20 APRIL DEBATING ARTICLE 73 OF

TAGS: PLOS To: STATE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006